

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division: Airport

Member: Alex Erskine
954-828-4966

Project Name: A. Sterling/Sterling Office
Building

Case #: 103-R-03

Date: October 14, 2003

Comments:

1. A Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration form (7460-1) must be filed with the FAA and a determination of no hazard to air navigation issued since the proposed building exceeds 200 feet in height.
2. A second Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration form (7460-1) must be filed with the FAA for any construction crane or equipment that will exceed the height of the building.

Recommendations:

1. The two notices should be filed with the FAA as soon as possible since it typically takes at least 60 days for the FAA to issue a determination.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division: Engineering

Member: Tim Welch
Engineering Design Mgr.
Office Ph. 954-828-5123
Office Fax: 954-828-5275
Email: timw@cityfort.com

Project Name: A. Sterling/Sterling Office Building

Case #: 103-R-03

Date: October 14, 2003

Comments:

1. The attached narrative refers to the former name of the Broward County Dept. of Planning and Environmental Protection (BCDPEP). The applicant should revise this reference from "DNRP" to "DPEP."
2. The engineer shall apply for and obtain a general or surface water management license from the Broward County Department of Environmental Protection (BCDPEP). Submit certified calculations and drawings to engineering reviewer prior to requesting final DRC authorization. Submit plans for building permit application with the license from Broward County DPEP and associated drainage calculations.
3. This development will consist of office and retail with a total trip generation of approximately 2,545 trips per day. The owner has consulted with Tinter Associates, Inc. for preparation of the required Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) pursuant to Section 47-25.2 of the City Code of Ordinances. Walter H. Keller, Inc. shall serve as City's consultant in reviewing the applicant's TIA.
4. The applicant shall address and effectively resolve all matters of concern arising from the previously mentioned review prior to applicant receiving staff's authorization to proceed to the Planning & Zoning Board or City Commission hearings, as applicable. The City's consultant shall evaluate the regional and local traffic impacts as well as site operations.
5. It is apparent from review of Section 47-24.5.A.2 and 47-24.5.A.3 that this property was platted prior to 1953, but the lands used for this proposed new building is not specifically delineated as a lot or parcel for development. It seems that portions of delineated lots from the original plat developed differently than original platted. This alternate aggregation of lots (parcel) would require re-platting.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

6. A ten (10) foot right-of-way dedication in accordance with Section 47-24.5.D.1.i is required from this site frontage on S.W. 2 Street with a chord of twenty-five (25) foot radius at its intersection with S.W. 1 Avenue. An additional fifteen (15) feet is required along West Las Olas Boulevard frontage, and an additional five (5) feet on S.W. 1 Avenue for remainder of the site frontage, all these streets being a collector street.
7. The applicant's and City's consultants shall review the proposed layout for right-of-way improvements, pedestrian corridor improvements, and infrastructure for compliance with the City's Code of Ordinances and Comprehensive Plan. It appears that significant opportunities exist to better enhance safety and accessibility for pedestrians, introduce public metered parking, and potentially improve traffic circulation both on and around this site. A round table meeting of City's Transportation Engineering, Parking Manager, Maintenance Division, Development Review Engineer, Planners, and traffic consultants could result in greater enhancements to the proposed rights-of-way improvements.
8. The engineer shall evaluate the condition of and available space in the public right-of-way for drainage facilities (minimum 15-inch perforated piping, Type C catch basins and exfiltration trench per Engineering Department Specifications and Details). If adequate service requires larger piping diameter and space is not available in the public right-of-way a drainage easement of ten (10) to fifteen (15) feet width may be provided on site to serve the public need for it. This system shall be designed for connection and adequacy to convey or receive storm water to or from other existing drainage facilities near the project by way of a bonded engineering permit.
9. Owner of the referenced property is advised that no site plan approval shall be issued until said site plan reflects all easements, rights of way or encroachments recorded over this property. No building permit shall be issued until the City is supplied with a signed and sealed survey showing all above ground improvements, open and notorious evidence of encroachments, utilities or rights of way and all easements, rights of way and encroachments. This survey shall be based on an abstract of title dated no earlier than ninety (90) days prior to the date of building permit application. Copies of all relevant deeds or other documents evidencing those matters of title shown on the site plan and survey shall be provided to the City along with the survey, along with a copy of the title abstract. Additionally, an affidavit shall be provided by an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of Florida attesting to no additional recordings of easements or encroachments from the remainder of time from ninety (90) days prior to the date of permit application to the date of issuance.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

10. The owner shall provide a signed statement agreeing to satisfy all components of item 4 (above) prior to requesting final DRC authorization.
11. The owner shall contact Maurice Tobon, P.E., Engineering Design Mgr./Waterworks 2011 Program Office to obtain a letter ensuring adequate water and sewer service for this development. In the event the City's infrastructure is found inadequate the developer shall prepare a report assessing the additional capacity necessary to serve the development and assist the City staff with design upgrades for the collection and transmission systems (and/or treatment plant capacity) increase to facilitate approval of this site plan approval.
12. The preliminary engineered utilities infrastructure plans do not indicate a meter vault for the potable meter. This plan (sheet C-2) indicates a meter in what is to be dedicated right-of-way, does not indicate the sewer lateral size necessary to serve the site, or adequacy improvements necessary in the event existing gravity is inadequate for serving this site.
13. Please document (report on) the coordination efforts applied with City's Engineering staff to coordinate this projects right-of-way improvements with that of the proposed Downtown Development Authority (DDA) programmed improvements on S.W. 2 Street.
14. Please provide typical cross-sectional views of the proposed grading around the perimeter of the entire site. These typical sections shall provide sufficient detailing of the site grading, proposed structures, landscaping, and any other contributing factors causing storm water runoff to the public rights-of-way.
15. It appears that the proposed stairs and grade changes along S.W. 1 Avenue may be inappropriate. There appears to be only about 1.5 to 2.0 feet for landing at the top of curb south of S.W. 2 Street as indicated on Sheet A-1.1, and this design (including the elevated brick sidewalk) may present safety concerns with public access through any resulting public right-of-way if the developers plans are accomplished.
16. The proposed site plan presents sight visibility concerns and conflicts with pedestrians on the sidewalks and vehicular use areas on S.W. 2 Street.
17. It appears that several structural columns will be within the required sight triangle at the intersection of the driveways and S.W. 2 Street. These columns are not permitted between 2.5 and 8 feet in height per Section 47-20.5.C.5.b.i.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

18. The proposed plan indicates a street light will be left in the vehicular use area. A separate engineering permit is required following a coordination meeting with the Public Services Department's Engineering Permit Review and Maintenance Division prior to authorization to relocate any City street lighting.
19. Photometric (lighting) plan shall conform to Section 47-20.14.
20. Indicate how solid waste will be stored and picked up for this site.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division: Fire

Member: Albert Weber
954-828-5875

Project Name: A. Sterling/Sterling Office
Building

Case #: 103-R-03

Date: October 14, 2003

Comments:

1. Flow test required.
2. Show hydrant location
3. Show sprinkler main with DDC and FDC
4. 412 of the FBC apply to this project.
5. Show all the floor plans and roof plan.
6. Show the fire rated walls adjacent to the property lines.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division: Info. Systems

Member: Mark Pallans
(GRG)
954-828-5790

Project Name: A. Sterling/Sterling Office
Building

Case #: 103-R-03

Date: October 14, 2003

Comments:

1. This site plan will adversely impact the City's communication networks in the future. The combined effects of building construction in Fort Lauderdale are having an adverse impact on the performance of the City's communication networks. Costs of mitigating the impact on the City's communication networks shall be born by the developer. This shall include the purchase and installation of network equipment required to restore communications impacted by this development.

Recommendations:

1. The City will require the developer to utilize the roof for City communications infrastructure components provided by the developer. This includes, but is not limited to; antennas, repeaters, UPS power supplies, and antennas. The building owners shall provide a secure climate controlled environment, no less than 100 square feet, preferably 10x10x10, and suitable for sensitive electronic equipment. This room shall be located within the top floor or roof area to allow for less than one-hundred (100) foot cable runs to the antenna locations. Power for the equipment in this room shall be fed from the building emergency generator. The developer shall provide one or more antenna mounting structures that are capable of supporting no less than 10 individual antennas spaced no less than 4 feet apart. Additional construction and equipment specifications will be made available as required.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division: Landscape

Member: Dave Gennaro
954-828-5200

Project Name: A. Sterling/Sterling Office Building

Case #: 103-R-03

Date: October 14, 2003

Comments:

1. Brickell Ave. (SW 1 Ave.) is a "Pedestrian Priority Street". Accordingly, shade tree street trees are required on this frontage as per Sect. 47-13. Note that shade trees need at least an 8' wide pervious planting area, and must be 15' from structures. (The "Landscape Calculations" are in error as SW 1 Ave. is not a "non pedestrian priority street".
2. Verify that the required numbers of street trees are met for the "Pedestrian Priority Streets, and the other RAC streets.
3. The designated shade tree street tree for Las Olas Blvd. is the Live Oak, not the Lysiloma.
4. Indicate all utilities (both aboveground, and below) that would affect proposed planting on the Landscape Plan. If there are any overheads, they should be placed underground.
5. Other comments may be made at meeting.

Recommendations:

DRC

SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT

REPORT

Division: Planning

Member: Lois Udvardy
828-5862

Project Name: A. Sterling/Sterling Office Building

Case #: 103-R-03

Date: October 14, 2003

Site Plan Review/124,728 S.F. of office with 26,805 S.F. of retail/RAC-CC
218 S.W. 1 Ave.

Comments:

1. Project is subject to 30 day City Commission call-up after Preliminary DRC and Pre-CC sign-offs.
2. Discuss provision for a traffic study with Engineering representative and the applicant at the meeting. If required, an outside consultant will be selected by the City in order to review the applicant's study. The applicant shall incur the City's costs for these consultant services. The traffic study must be submitted and reviewed by the City prior to the project obtaining Preliminary CC and DRC sign-offs.
3. Expand text narrative to include but not be limited to: maintenance operations, loading/service systems, addition or elimination of on-street parking, building's architectural style et. al. Provide narrative on author's letterhead.
4. Both Las Olas Blvd. and Brickell Ave. are pedestrian priority streets in accordance with ULDR Sec. 47-13.20.G.1. As such, provide a point-by-point narrative outlining compliance with all pedestrian priority street requirements in accordance with ULDR Sec. 47-13.20.H. Write each ULDR requirement and then indicate how project complies. Additional staff comment may be forthcoming upon receipt of this information.
5. Pursuant ULDR Sec. 47-25.2.P, the applicant shall be required to contact Chris Eck (954 765 4671) with the Broward County Historical Commission and confirm whether the development site is located in an archeologically significant area. If so, the applicant, at a minimum, will be required to complete a Phase I archeological survey/study.

Pursuant to Objective 11, Policy 11.3 of the Historical Element of the Comprehensive Plan, all proposed impacts to historic resources shall be reported

DRC

SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT

REPORT

to the Historic Preservation Board for review and comment. Since the proposed development is located in close proximity to historically designated properties, this narrative should both identify the impacts and offer recommendations to mitigate these impacts. This document shall be forwarded to a consultant retained by the City to confirm these impacts, who will review the document and offer comments.

Pursuant to ULDR Sec. 47-24.1.H, the applicant shall pay any additional costs incurred by the City, including review by a consultant on behalf of the City.

6. Discuss provision for any additional right-of-way dedications or easements with DRC Engineering representative and the applicant at the meeting.
7. Provide detail and label area above optional tenant signage location on the South and North elevations. If grillage, density to be at a level to screen automobiles and cables.
8. Indicate property lines and setbacks on all elevations and floor plans.
9. Discuss provision for additional architectural elements being applied to the parking garage façade beyond the existing Halmos building.
10. Provide dimension to upper most portion of the building (spire).
11. Provide roof plan indicating mechanical equipment and screening.
12. Provide parking garage grillage detail. Grillwork density to be at a level to screen all automobiles and cables. Also, indicate garage lighting and shields. Lights to be screened. Discuss with Zoning representative and applicant at the meeting.
13. Regarding physical, communications, and radar obstructions, the FAA requires a review for interference by the proposed construction. Provide a letter from the FAA indicating that such a review has been performed. FAA approval must be obtained prior to 30 day City Commission call-up sign-off unless otherwise deemed unnecessary by the City Airport Manager.
14. Provide project's staging plan. Discuss with DRC Engineering representative at the meeting.
15. Provide 7 ft. min. sidewalk on S.W. 2 Street. Match existing sidewalk width (est. 10 ft.) along Halmos building for portion of proposal along S.W. 1 Ave. Match existing sidewalk width along existing 3-story building to the east for a portion of the project along W. Las Olas Blvd.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

16. Modify table indicating the required and all proposed setbacks for the project.
Label by direction (i.e. N, S, E & W) and provide setbacks from existing building.
17. Label use on S. end of proposed building on the site plan and ground floor plan.
18. Discuss vehicular stacking for parking garage entry with Engineering representative and applicant at the meeting.
19. Label floor plans by level.
20. Proposal may alter existing Special Entertainment District. Discuss with the applicant at the meeting. Staff contact person for clarification is Kevin Erwin at 954 828 6534.
21. Recommend shade trees on S.W. 1 Ave. or a combination of shade and palm trees. Discuss with Landscaping representative and the applicant at the meeting.
22. Provide section indicating the relationship between the proposed building, sidewalk, landscape area and the street from S.W. 1 Ave.
23. Recommend stepback above the cornice on S.W. 1 Ave.
24. Discuss elimination or addition of public parking spaces with Engineering representative and the applicant at the meeting. Contact Doug Gottshall, Parking Systems Manager, 954 828-3793. Final DRC and Pre-CC plans must have Mr. Gottshall's approval signature. Provide on-street parking space dimensions on the site plan.
25. Recommend presenting proposal to any local association and neighbors for public input.
26. Provide narrative outlining project's compliance (point-by-point) with ULDR Sec. 47-13.20, General Design and Density Standards et al. Narrative shall cite each requirement as written in the ULDR and how project complies with such.
27. Provide narrative outlining project's compliance (point-by-point) with ULDR Sec. 47-24.2, Adequacy Requirements.
28. Label all colors and materials on elevations.
29. Provide a copy of the most current recorded plat for the proposed site. Applicant shall provide documentation verifying that site does not require replatting, i.e., specifically delineated lots under previous plat, and verification letter from Broward County Planning Council.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

30. Response to all comments shall be permitted within 90 calendar days or project may be subject to additional DRC review.
31. Additional comments may be forthcoming at DRC meeting.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division:	Police	Member:	Detective Nate Jackson Office-954-828-6422 Pager-954-877-7875 Fax -954-828-6423
Project Name:	A. Sterling/Sterling Office Building	Case #:	103-R-03
Date:	October 14, 2003		

Comments:

1. Will loading zone type 1& 2 have a roll down security gate?
2. Recommend that all stairwell doors in retail and office area have signage that usage is for emergency only.
3. Recommend that all stairwell doors in the retail and office area have annunciators that identify its location when activated.
4. CCTV should be a mandatory devise to aid security personnel.
5. Parking garage should be monitored by CCTV and have signage informing that garage is under surveillance.
6. Emergency annunciators should be strategically positioned in the parking garage.
7. All fire doors should lead to an exit at grade.
8. Can office floors be accessible via stairwells from the garage?
9. If yes to # 8, how will stairwells me protected or monitored.
10. Please document response.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division: Zoning

Member: Terry Burgess
954-828-5913

Project Name: A. Sterling/Sterling Office
Building

Case #: 103-R-03

Date: October 14, 2003

Comments:

1. Provide a narrative outlining how the proposed new development complies with section 47-13.20, 47-13.20.G.1, 47-13.20.H, 47-25.2, also include information on maintenance operations, trash pickup and the buildings architectural style and the compatible architectural features used to complement the adjacent historical building.
2. The project is subject to a Historic Preservation Board hearing due to the adjacent historic Halmos Building.
3. Discuss requirement for additional right-of-way with the Engineering representative.
4. Provide a staging, construction trailer plan prior to final DRC review.
5. Provide the property line with setbacks on the elevation plans.
6. FAA approval required prior to final DRC review.
7. Dimension vehicular stacking distance from the property line to lift gates on site plan.
8. Discuss sidewalk width with the Planning representative.
9. Indicate and dimension all sight triangles on site pursuant to section 47-20.5.C.5.b.
10. Dimension height to the top of spire.
11. Additional comment may be discussed at the DRC meeting.